



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

This is certainly 'apostasy from faith,' and this feature is not confined to the teachings of Rome and rationalists. *Nearly the whole* of the literature and pulpit utterances of modern Protestantism have the same tendency." But happily such passages are not common.

J. H. BARBOUR.

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Middletown, Conn.

General Introduction to the Old Testament: the Canon. By WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. xviii + 209. \$1.50.

This volume, since it is clearly the precursor of others, is the promise that Professor Green purposes to publish the results of his lifelong labors in the department of Old Testament introduction. We rejoice in this fact, since there is no living scholar who can speak with greater representative authority than Professor Green in behalf of the traditional views of the Old Testament, and there is a lack of literature brought up to date setting forth these views. In the present volume we have presented the old view of the history and formation of the Old Testament Canon. Certain concessions, however, are made to the results of modern scholarship. The story of the men of the great synagogue is rejected as unhistorical, and the date of 130 B. C. is allowed for the prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus. The volume is written also throughout as a reply to the modern critical theory of the Canon.

This theory is: (1) that the recognition of the books of the Old Testament as sacred or canonical was due, while not without the influence of authorship, real or supposed, yet essentially to *their contents*, representing the religious law and principles of Israel and meeting the demands of their religious life and experience; and (2) that the Jewish divisions of the Canon, the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings,¹ mark three chronological stages in which the books were received, either by formal authority or common consent, the first division dating from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the second and third

¹ The Law included Gen., Ex., Lev., Numb., and Deut.; the Prophets, Josh., Judg., 1 and 2 Sam., 1 and 2 Kings, Isa., Jer., and Ezek.; the Writings, Psalms, Job, Prov., Cant., Ruth, Lam., Eccles., Esth., Dan., Ezra, Neh., 1 and 2 Chron.

from later, though not well-defined periods — the Prophets, as a collection, being earlier than the date of the Maccabees; and the Writings, as a complete collection, not earlier.

Over against this opinion Professor Green holds that the determining principle of the formation of the Canon was, not their contents or the religious character of the books, but *their authorship*, and that the Canon was complete at the time of Ezra. That we may be seen not to have misrepresented him on this first point (for he seems to shrink from bluntly expressing his view in our words), we give his own statements. He says :

It is not the religious profit derived from these books which led to their admission into the Canon, but it is their being inspired of God to guide the faith and practice of the church—in other words, their canonicity, which makes them profitable to the religious life. They were included in the Canon because they were written by men inspired of God for this very purpose [p. 31]. . . . Each individual book of an acknowledged prophet, of Jehovah, or of anyone accredited by him to make known his will, was accepted as the word of God immediately upon its appearance. It had its own independent authority, derived from the source from which it came, irrespective of its being united in a collection with other books of the same character. . . . Those books, and those only, were accepted as the divine standards of their [Israel's] faith and regulative of their conduct, which were written for this definite purpose by those whom they believed to be inspired of God. It was this which made them canonical. The spiritual profit found in them corresponded with and confirmed the belief in their heavenly origin (pp. 35–6).

This view of Professor Green is agreeable to the current teaching of the older theology, that the primary evidence of a divine revelation is a miracle or an appeal to the senses rather than to man's moral and spiritual nature. The Old Testament narrative, however, and all that we can learn of the history of the Canon, do not seem to confirm this view. There is no evidence that the writers of the Old Testament were generally recognized as inspired apart from their oral and written utterances. Miracles which might attest their inspiration are not recorded in connection with the lives of more than a very few of them. It is difficult, also, on this theory to account for the fact that so large a number of the Old Testament writings are anonymous, and that, when authors are mentioned, only in a few instances are particulars of their lives given. In short, the facts at our command do not support the view that canonicity depended upon authorship.

In respect to the second point, the completion of the Canon at the

time of Ezra, Professor Green is naturally forced to this position from his determining principle, since in Ezra and Nehemiah the line of men who might be regarded as inspired, according to the Old Testament narratives, ceases, and hence, likewise, according to Professor Green's theory, the production of sacred writings, and therefore the Canon, is then necessarily complete. Explicit testimony to this fact is found in the famous statement of Josephus that since Artaxerxes' time sacred books ceased "because the exact succession of the prophets had ceased." This view requires Professor Green to defend a date for the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, Esther, and Daniel not later than the time of Artaxerxes. This he does with especial reference to the contrary modern opinion given in Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament*.

The separation between the Prophets and the Writings Professor Green finds not due to difference of contents or degrees of inspiration, but to the official status of the writers. The authors of the Writings, he says, were "inspired men who were not prophets in the technical and official sense." They had the *donum propheticum*, but not the *munus propheticum*. The Scriptures, however, furnish no real evidence for this supposition, and it is difficult to understand why Daniel, called a prophet in the New Testament, is to be regarded as without the prophetic office; or how Amos was officially recognized as a prophet when he says that he was neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet.

To one who in advance believes, on dogmatic grounds, with Professor Green in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the historical inerrancy of the Old Testament, his work may seem a cogent presentation of his subject, but to all others it will reveal the utter inadequacy of the old traditional views historically to explain biblical facts. A pathetic feature of the work is that, in appealing to authorities in support of his views, Professor Green is obliged to call a roll of the dead.

The book is marred by the lack of an index, something inexcusable in a work of its character at the present time.

EDWARD L. CURTIS.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn.